



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

volume in each set, rather than they should fall complete into the enemies' hands. How the world has suffered here, and we have to suffer with it. War has limited the immortality of art.

And religion is insisting more and more upon peace. After nearly two thousand years of teaching, following the life of the one called "the Prince of Peace," his followers are awaking to the matter in earnest. Religion now has dreams of a parliament of man,—a federation of the world,—and it points to the sense of community of feelings lying below accidental divergence, disclosed more and more in missionary endeavors. Religion affirms that if great organized states like our own American Commonwealth, with differing interests, can dwell together in peace, a greater commonwealth of nations is no lunatic dream, but the very social form of the kingdom of heaven. It says that if our land, and other civilized lands, can preserve order by a small fraction of shrieval force, that the belief in the same possibility for the whole world is no folly of the night. It affirms that we are all children of a common Father, and that each man is necessary to all other men. It says that if God loves the world, we, at our best, love it too, and that if we are saved we are saved *with* our fellows and not without them. National life, I believe, is only a transition stage to a far nobler generalization,—the finally victorious commonweal of the kingdom of God. The transition state may, and doubtless will, leave some marks upon men, and it is well that it should be so, just as family life marks men within the greater family of society; but I believe that the time is speedily coming when passion and suspicion and hereditary-historic terrors affirmed of less known peoples than our own will be ended. Let us all do our best to bring this happy state into being! And may our working motto be, not "God and my right!"—the cry of older turbulent souls—but "God and His peace!"

Ernest Howard Crosby.

BY DR. J. T. SUNDERLAND.

The death roll of 1906 contains the name of no nobler man than Ernest Howard Crosby of New York. I want to lay a flower on his new-made grave. I want to say how ill the world could spare him. I want to say how glad I am, if he had to go, that he was spared to write the life of Samuel M. Jones, "Golden Rule Jones" as he is often called, mayor of Toledo, O., that strange but lovable man, who appeared suddenly in American business and American politics, and actually proposed to do things on the principle of the Golden Rule; and to the amazement of everybody actually did carry on a large business for years, and actually did conduct the government of a large city year after year, on the principle of the Golden Rule, and with success, with a success that everybody, even his fiercest opponents, was obliged to admit.

I say I am glad that Ernest Crosby was spared to write the life of "Golden Rule Jones" of Toledo. Mr. Crosby's death is a loss. His father, as some of you know, was the Rev. Dr. Howard Crosby of New York, one of the most distinguished Presbyterian clergymen of this country. After receiving the highest university honors and studying law, the son entered political life in New York,

where he had a successful, indeed a brilliant, career for a dozen years. Then he was appointed by President Harrison a judge of the international court in Alexandria, Egypt. After serving there for five years, he resigned, came home, and left political life to devote himself to the work of social and moral reform. For some years past he had given his whole time, with singular unselfishness and devotion, to writing, speaking and laboring in every way in his power, for the promotion of peace, temperance, civic purity and the elevation of the public life and public ideals of his city and country. Some have called him a dreamer, and unpractical, because he thought that peace is better than war; that evil can only be overcome by good, and not by more evil; that there should be honesty and honor in public life as well as in private; that international relations should be relations of reciprocity and justice; that the Golden Rule is practicable, in business and everywhere. Yes, he was a dreamer; he dreamed of better things for men, for society, for humanity; but he also did what he could to make his dreams come true, by courageous unflinching and honest work. He was impracticable, in the same way that Jesus was, that Socrates was, that Garrison was, that every one is who believes in God, and man, and love, and human brotherhood, and that life is more than meat.

HARTFORD, CONN.

The Teaching of History in a Civilized Country.

A Brief Rejoinder.

BY WILLIAM A. MOWRY, PH.D.

In the January number of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE, Dr. Ernst Richard of Columbia University gave an extended review of my article in the previous September number, which was entitled "The Teaching of History." I have to thank Professor Richard for many good words and evident kind consideration of my article, and I am free to say that with much of his paper I fully agree. The general principle pervading the article is correct, and possibly may prevent many readers of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE from getting a wrong notion.

It may not, perhaps, be out of place to say that my article was not written for the organ of the American Peace Society, but was, as stated at the head of the article, "A paper read at the meeting of the American Institute of Instruction, New Haven, July 10, 1906." It was prepared expressly for a company of American school teachers. Its design was twofold: first, to emphasize the importance of the teaching in our own schools of the history of our own country; second, and far more important, to urge upon the teachers and textbook makers a better and saner treatment of the periods of war and peace. This was to enforce the importance of emphasizing the triumphs of peace and minimizing the details of wars.

Dr. Richard takes no exception to this most important portion of the paper, but confines his objections to the first head. Here I think he misinterprets the intention and meaning of my paper, and I fear he has misunderstood my position. Possibly I did not make it sufficiently plain. I thought I had made my meaning clear, which was simply this: not that our American civilization is in advance of that of other nations; not that we

are a superior people; not that *they* are "an inferior people or race,"—but that, starting, as we did, in our colonial period on a low plane, with few advantages, we have in various ways made a more rapid advancement than others.

My critic, however, appears to think that I posed as "a Pharisee," and claimed a superior, or advanced, civilization.

Let me quote some of the Professor's words. He says: "Let us assume that the American people really tower high above all other nations in achievements of civilization." Surely my article implies nothing of the sort. Again: "Will not his claim of superiority alone be offensive to all self-respecting nations? Will he not in all international disputes look upon the claims of other nations as an impudence on the part of an inferior people or race? Will not his whole attitude towards the sons of other nations be either snobbish or condescending, in any case, irritating?" Again, the reviewer suggests: "No, my friends, it is not by the prayer of the Pharisee, elevating himself above the publican, that we gain the goodwill of others."

These quotations, I think, show clearly that the reviewer imagines the article under consideration to assert that our nation is superior to all others in its civilization; that we have attained a higher plane than Germany, or England, or any other nation. I beg to disclaim any such view, and I hope that another reading of my paper will show our good friend that he has mistaken my position entirely.

The Professor pertinently asks if "many of our fellow-citizens who want to acquire the highest culture" do not "find themselves compelled to go to Europe?" Certainly they do. Americans are the greatest travelers in the world (pardon another superlative.) That is one of the causes of our rapid advancement. We try to absorb all the good we can from all foreign nations. Again, my reviewer inquires: "If to-day we may be able to acquire it [the highest culture] here, is it not because it has been brought over by our students, or by artists and scholars, from the other side of the Atlantic?" Beyond any question this is largely true, and this shows how we avail ourselves of every means for our most rapid improvement. It is improvement, growth, advancement that we are striving after, and that is what I emphasized, and not status.

My article in no way intended to claim that the American nation is essentially superior to other nations, but it does claim that we have made in many respects unusually rapid advancement, which should be observed by the teachers in our schools. I tried to show that this development affects and pertains to the whole people. I believe that my eight points are essentially correct. Of course, other nations have also advanced, and the trend of the whole world is toward improvement, moral, intellectual and physical. Instead of the rapid advancement of America "irritating" the people of other nations and militating against "international solidarity," I believe it tends to spur them on to greater achievements. If my contentions are false, as the critic would have us believe, how can the tremendous wave of immigration into this country from all the nations of Europe, constantly increasing for more than sixty years, be accounted for. When a million a year are leaving the Old World

and making permanent homes for themselves and their children on these shores, surely there must be some reason for it.

Far be it from me to arrogate to America superiority to other nations. Not that we "have already obtained, or are already perfect," but we "press on toward the goal unto the prize."

HYDE PARK, MASS., Jan. 30, 1907.

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR:

In the interesting history of the American Peace Society and its work (ADVOCATE OF PEACE, January, 1907) there is a singular omission. Nothing is said about the activity of the Society in the winter of 1897-98, when the war with Spain was impending. What the Society thought about the proposed war and about "Remember the Maine" is left to conjecture. I began the article in the hope that it would throw light on that question. The fact that the writer of the history had the courage to denounce the "wickedness and folly" of the Mexican War encouraged me. But when I got down to 1898, I found a blank. What I wanted most was not there.

Was the omission accidental? Or am I alone in the belief that what we ought to think about that war is a matter of supreme practical importance? It will be seen that I have raised two questions here: (1) what the American Peace Society was doing when an ounce of prevention would have been worth a million tons of cure; and (2) what we who made that war ought to think of it. The latter is the question of transcendent importance.

For nearly ten years now I have sought diligently far and wide for light upon it. I have sought in vain. Everywhere I have found indifference, evasion, irrelevancy and subterfuge. Now am I wrong in the belief that it is the duty of every American to hold, promulgate, and defend an opinion about that and all similar questions? For myself, that seems to be the only way to wash my hands clean of blood. If the war was a crime, the fact of taxation makes me *particeps criminis*. But it was a crime unless its justifiability can be demonstrated. And I cannot do that by proxy. To preserve (or deserve) my self-respect, I must not only know that the killing was justifiable homicide, but I must put it in the power of my fellow-citizens to know it. Every taxpayer has a right to demand that at my hands. If there are reasons, I must formulate them. Living in an age when three centuries of scientific investigation have made it possible for men to reason logically to sound conclusions and know the truth,—living, moreover, in an age when knowledge of the truth has become absolutely indispensable to him who seeks to do his duty as a citizen,—I can find no excuse if I undertake to palm off on my neighbors the falsehood and sophistry which convince those who do not need to be convinced, because they were caught young and subdued to the habit of calling whatever "our country" does right.

But again, when I impose upon my countrymen the burden of taxation to pay the expenses of a foolish war, I wrong all the victims of that war. And the victims of the war with Spain are not only the Spanish mothers whose sons are rotting in Cuba; they are also my own countrymen who find the burden of taxation inflicted